



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/816,291

04/01/2004

Shailendra Mathur

A2003015(2)

8582

26643

7590

10/15/2008

PETER J. GORDON, PATENT COUNSEL
AVID TECHNOLOGY, INC.
ONE PARK WEST
TEWKSBURY, MA 01876

EXAMINER

SALOMON, PHENUEL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,291	Applicant(s) MATHUR, SHAILENDRA	
	Examiner PHENUEL S. SALOMON	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on July 25, 2008. Claim 1 is amended and claims 1-5 are pending.
2. The rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-functional descriptive material have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samra (US2003/0085932 A1) in view of Georgiev (US 6,377,712 B1).

Claim 1: Samra discloses a graphical user interface comprising:

an editing window (*when creating a movie, sequences of images are traditionally shot with a camera, developed and edited to create a finished product*) (p.1, para. [0012]);

means for enabling a user to interactively edit in the editing window one or more transformation hierarchies of, wherein a transformation provides transformation operator data as an output (*fig. 2a depicts an example compositing tree comprised of effects and images. A compositing tree is a directed*

Art Unit: 2178

acyclic graph that results when a user of a compositing program selects images and to create a final resulting image. When using compositing programs, a user manually designates images, sequences of images, and effects that will be combined to form a resulting sequence of images. The compositing tree reflects the selections made by the user and may be depicted in various ways.) (p.2, para. [0019]);

means for enabling a user to interactively edit in the editing window one or more effects trees including effects operators wherein at least one effect operator in the effect tree has one or more inputs for receiving transformation data and has a local transformation specification that is combined with the received transformation data (*compositing tree with effects trees or operators for receiving multiple inputs where those inputs are transformed (composite output data) to create composited sequence of images where output of transformed data is inputted into an effect operator*) (p.2, para [0020], [0021] and fig. 2); and

a display operable to present the editing window including both the one or more transformation hierarchies and the one or more effects trees to the user (fig. 1, item 22).

means for enabling a user to connect an output of a transformation operator to an input of an effect for receiving the transformation data (fig. 2 b), but Samra does not explicitly disclose including one or more geometrical transformations operators employing mathematical matrices

However, Georgiev discloses Kernels 110 represent geometric transforms that warp digital image 105 and produce different levels of smoothness, rigidity, or flexibility. Warping engine 125 applies the resultant mesh 120 to input digital image 105 in order to generate output digital image 107, thereby warping input image 105 to achieve unique artistic effects. (col.2, lines 55-61) and (col. 7, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include geometrical transformations operators in Samra. One would have been motivated to do so in order to give user greater flexibility and greater control in editing transform hierarchies within effects tree.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 2: Samra and Georgiev disclose the graphical user interface as in claim 1 above, Samra further discloses an effect operator also has an input for receiving image data and an output for providing the received image data processed according to the transformation data (see fig. 2).

Claim 3: Samra and Georgiev disclose the graphical user interface as in claim 1 above, Samra further discloses the received transformation data is combined with the local transformation specification of the effect operator as a pre-transform (p.2, para [0020], [0021] and fig. 2).

Claim 4: Samra and Georgiev disclose the graphical user interface as in claim 1 above, Samra further discloses the received transformation data is combined with the local transformation specification of the effect operator as a post-transform (p.2, para [0020], [0021] and fig. 2).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samra (US2003/0085932 A1) in view of Georgiev (US 6,377,712 B1) and in further view of Trinh et al. (US 6,924,821 B2).

Claim 5: Samra and Georgiev disclose the graphical user interface as in claim 1 above, wherein transforms operators in a transformation hierarchy and effects operators in an effect tree (p. 2, para [0020]-[0021]), are both but do not explicitly disclose kinds of time-varying objects. However, Trinh discloses a process tree that defines operations carried out based on timewarp (col. 7, lines 3-7) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2178

include time varying in Samra. One would have been motivated to do so in order to synchronize the editing process.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on April 11, 2008 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues: there is no evidence in the record that supports an assertion that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized, prior to this invention that it was desirable to edit transform hierarchies within an effects tree, or that greater flexibility or greater control would have been provided by doing so.

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Samra does disclose effects applied to media in a tree view and different transformations that lead to the end result and Georgiev states that to achieve a good visual effect, the user must define the distortion at a large number of points throughout the image and this can be achieved at a high cost of user effort (col. 1, lines 34-37). Georgiev makes it easier in such a way that user does not have to define hundreds of points of distortion by hand, which is labor intensive and time consuming. Therefore, user gets greater flexibility and control in editing transform hierarchies within effects tree.

As per claim 5, applicant argues: Samra does not describe transform operators in a transformation hierarchy and effect operators in an effect tree are both kinds of time-varying objects.

Art Unit: 2178

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Samra discloses composited sequence of images in a transformation hierarchy where user can choose different types of effects that images can go thru and one transformation output will be the inputted into another set of transform operators an effect in order to obtain a desired output (p. 2, para. [0020],[0021]). And Trinh comes into play to complement Samra deficiencies of time-varying (col. 7, lines 3-7).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
a. Martin (US 5,668,639) discloses method for video editing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phenuel S. Salomon whose telephone number is (571) 270-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. (Alternate Friday Off) EST.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272 4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PSS
/Phenuel S. Salomon/
10/02/2008

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178